

Serial No.: 10/673,207
Docket No.: 101-1004
Amendment dated June 10, 2011
Reply to the Office Action of February 15, 2011

REMARKS

Introduction

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that each of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of October 27, 2005 have been considered.

Claims 43, 45-48, 51 and 57 are pending in the application. Claim 43 has been amended. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in FIGS. 1A-6 and the corresponding portions of the detailed description, including paragraphs [0009], [0010], and [0029]. Claims 1-42, 44, 49, 50, and 52-56 have been previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 43, 45, 47, 48, 51, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,498,658 to Sekikawa (hereinafter, "Sekikawa") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,019,869 to Chen (hereinafter, "Chen"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 43

Referring to independent claim 43, in the Office Action dated February 15, 2011, the Examiner alleges that Sekikawa and Chen in combination with one another disclose all of the limitations as recited in independent claim 43. However, it is respectfully submitted that Sekikawa and Chen, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, do not teach or suggest all of the features as presently recited in independent claim 43, for at least the following reasons.

Referring to FIGS. 1, 3A, and 3B, col. 6, line 25 to col. 7, line 25, and col. 9, lines 50-56, Sekikawa illustrates and describes that when a digital copier executes a copy job, "image data"

Serial No.: 10/673,207
Docket No.: 101-1004
Amendment dated June 10, 2011
Reply to the Office Action of February 15, 2011

is read by the scanner part 110 and is stored in memory W 114. Sekikawa illustrates in FIG. 3B and describes that the "image data" that is stored in memory W 114 is output to a memory card, a printer, a serial port, or memory S 119. That is, Sekikawa describes that "image data" is read by the scanner part 110 and stored in memory, not that the "scanned document data" that is "stored" in a "USB memory unit" is in a scanned "document data format." Applicants submit that Sekikawa describes storing "image data" of a scanned document, not that the "scanned document data" is "stored" in a "USB memory unit" in a "document data format."

Referring to col. 3, lines 25-28 and 51-62, Chen describes that an image scanning unit 110 "scan[s] documents" to generate "image data" of the documents. Chen describes that the control unit 140 transforms "image files" with an "image format like JPEG" to "faxable image data" to be faxed by the faxing unit. That is, Chen describes scanning documents to generate "image data" that is converted to "faxable image data" to be faxed, not that the "scanned document data" that is "stored" in a "USB memory unit" is in a scanned "document data format." Applicants submit that Chen describes transforming the "image data" files that are stored at a "data storage media" to "faxable image data," not that the "scanned document data" is "stored" in a "USB memory unit" in a "document data format."

Therefore, Sekikawa and Chen, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, do not teach or suggest, among other things, that "the scanned document data stored in the USB memory unit is in a scanned document data format" as presently recited in independent claim 43.

Since Sekikawa and Chen, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, do not teach or suggest all of the features as recited in independent claim 43, claim 43 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

Claims 45, 47, 48, 51 and 57

With regard to claims 45, 47, 48, 51 and 57, it is requested that for at least the reasons that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 43, and therefore contain all of the

Serial No.: 10/673,207
Docket No.: 101-1004
Amendment dated June 10, 2011
Reply to the Office Action of February 15, 2011

features recited in claim 43, claims 45, 47, 48, 51 and 57 are also patentable over Sekikawa and Chen, whether taken alone or in combination with one another.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekikawa in view of Chen and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0021766 to Iwai (hereinafter, "Iwai"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants submit that independent claim 43, from which claim 46 depends, is patentably distinguishable from Sekikawa and Chen, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicants submit that Iwai, whether taken alone or in combination with Sekikawa and Chen, do not teach or suggest all of the features as presently recited in independent claim 43, for at least the following reasons.

Referring to paragraphs [0009] and [0010], Iwai describes "a broadcasting receiving system" including a "broadcasting receiving apparatus" and a "program reservation terminal" so that a "user" can "perform a program reservation operation anywhere." Iwai describes that the "program reservation terminal" includes a "first slot" for a "removable storage medium," and an "external storage control means" for "storing reservation data" that is "entered by the program reservation input means" in the "removable storage medium via the first slot." That is, Iwai describes "storing reservation data" in the "removable storage medium," not that "scanned document data" stored in a "USB memory unit" is in a scanned "document data format." Applicants submit that Iwai describes storing "reservation data," not that "scanned document data" is "stored" in a "USB memory unit" in a "document data format."

Therefore, Chen, Sekikawa, and Iwai, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, do not teach or suggest, among other things, that "the scanned document data stored in the USB memory unit is in a scanned document data format" as presently recited in independent claim 43.

Serial No.: 10/673,207
Docket No.: 101-1004
Amendment dated June 10, 2011
Reply to the Office Action of February 15, 2011

Since Sekikawa, Chen, and Iwai, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, do not teach or suggest all of the features as recited in independent claim 43, claim 43 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

With regard to claim 46, it is requested that for at least the reasons that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 43, and therefore contains all of the features recited in claim 43, claim 46 is also patentable over Sekikawa, Chen, and Iwai, whether taken alone or in combination with one another.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

Examiner's Response to Arguments

In the Remarks above, Applicants address the Examiner's Response to Arguments recited on pages 7-9 of the Office Action, as well as the rejections recited on pages 2-7 of the Office Action. Reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the above remarks is earnestly solicited.

In-Person Examiner Interview

The June 8, 2011 Interview Summary issued in connection with the in-person Examiner interview of the same date stated that independent claim 43 as presently amended "will overcome the current cited reference." Applicants submit that for at least this reason, as well as the reasons discussed above, the pending claims are patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/673,207
Docket No.: 101-1004
Amendment dated June 10, 2011
Reply to the Office Action of February 15, 2011

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 502827.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Dated: June 10, 2011
919 18th St., NW, Suite 440
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 775-1900
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901

By: 
Kevin T. Roddy
Registration No. 50,577